arXiv:1512.07009v1 [math.RA] 22 Dec 2015

DECIDING ABSORPTION

LIBOR BARTO AND ALEXANDR KAZDA

Abstract. We characterize absorption in finite idempotent algebras by means of Jónsson absorption and cube term blockers. As an application we show that it is decidable whether a given subset is an absorbing subuniverse of an algebra given by the tables of its basic operations.

Keywords: absorbing subalgebra, Jónsson absorbing subalgebra, near unanimity term, Jónsson terms, cube term, cube term blocker, congruence distributivity, few subpowers

Mathematics Subject Classification 2010: 08A70,08B10

1. Introduction

A subuniverse B (or a subalgebra $\mathbf{B}$) of an algebra $\mathbf{A}$ is *absorbing* if $\mathbf{A}$ has an idempotent term t such that $t(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in B$ whenever all but at most one of the arguments $a_1, \dots, a_n$ are in B and the exceptional argument is from A. Absorption played a key role in the proofs of several results concerning Maltsev conditions and the complexity of the constraint satisfaction problem (see eg. [5], [8], [7], and [6]) and it is directly used in the simplified algorithm for conservative constraint satisfaction problems from [2]. The applicability of this concept has two sources. On one hand, some useful properties of algebras and their subpowers are inherited by their absorbing subalgebras (see eg. Lemma 9) and, on the other hand, a finite algebra has a proper absorbing subalgebra under mild assumptions (see the Absorption Theorem from [5]).

However, from the definition of absorption, it is not clear how to decide, given finite $\mathbf{A}$ and its subuniverse B, whether B absorbs $\mathbf{A}$. This problem is closely connected to the problem of deciding whether a given finite algebra has a near unanimity (NU) term of some arity. Indeed, a finite algebra $\mathbf{A}$ has an NU term if and only if every singleton in A is an absorbing subuniverse of the full idempotent reduct of $\mathbf{A}$.

Miklós Maróti has shown [18] that the near unanimity problem is decidable, although his algorithm has enormous time complexity. For idempotent algebras, we provide the following generalization of his result.

Theorem 1. *Deciding, given a finite idempotent* $\mathbf{A}$ *and its subuniverse* B*, whether* $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$ *is co-NP-complete, and is fixed parameter tractable when parametrized by the product of the arities of the basic operations in* $\mathbf{A}$*.*

Note that this theorem, as stated, does not imply Maróti's NU result for non-idempotent algebras since it is not clear at first how to decide whether B is an absorbing subuniverse of the full idempotent reduct of a given $\mathbf{A}$. However, using the techniques from [14] it is straightforward to adapt our algorithm to this more general problem in exchange for a worse time complexity.

To prove Theorem 1 we generalize, for finite idempotent algebras, a relatively recent discovery [10, 17] that having an NU term is equivalent to the conjunction of two weaker Maltsev conditions – having Jónsson terms and having a cube term.

Having Jónsson terms is a classical condition which characterizes algebras in congruence distributive varieties [12]. In a similar way in which absorption generalizes NU terms, Jónsson terms can be generalized to Jónsson absorption (see Definition 5). In particular, "B Jónsson absorbs $\mathbf{A}$" is a weakening of "B absorbs $\mathbf{A}$".

Having a cube term is a substantially more recent condition which characterizes, for finite algebras, the property of having few subpowers and number of other important properties [10, 15]. A useful equivalent condition to "$\mathbf{A}$ has a cube term" (assuming $\mathbf{A}$ is finite and idempotent) is "$\mathbf{A}$ has no cube term blockers", where a cube term blocker is a pair of subuniverses with certain properties, see [16]. In particular, since cube terms are weaker than NU terms, no algebra with an NU term can have a cube term blocker. This fact can be also generalized to absorption: some of the cube term blockers, which we call B-blockers, prevent B from being an absorbing subuniverse of $\mathbf{A}$ (see Definition 13). In other words, "$\mathbf{A}$ has no B-blockers" is a weakening of "B absorbs $\mathbf{A}$".

The main result of this paper shows that absorption is equivalent to the conjunction of the two of its weaker forms described above:

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a finite idempotent algebra and B a subuniverse of $\mathbf{A}$. Then the following are equivalent.*

(i) *B absorbs $\mathbf{A}$.*
(ii) *B Jónsson absorbs $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{A}$ has no B-blocker.*

2. Preliminaries

We use rather standard universal algebraic terminology [11, 9]: We denote algebras by capital letters $\mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{B}$, $\mathbf{R}$, ... in boldface. The same letters A, B, R, ... in the plain font are used to denote universes of algebras. We will call a subuniverse or a subalgebra of a power a *subpower*. We mostly consider finite algebras that are idempotent, that is, each basic operation f satisfies the identity $f(x, x, \dots, x) \approx x$.

2.1. Absorption.

Definition 3. Let $\mathbf{A}$ be an algebra and B a subuniverse of $\mathbf{A}$. We say that B *absorbs* $\mathbf{A}$ if there is an idempotent term t of $\mathbf{A}$ such that whenever $b_1, \dots, b_n \in B$ and $a \in A$, then

$$\begin{aligned} t(a, b_2, b_3, \dots, b_{n-1}, b_n) &\in B \\ t(b_1, a, b_3, \dots, b_{n-1}, b_n) &\in B \\ &\vdots \\ t(b_1, b_2, b_3, \dots, b_{n-1}, a) &\in B. \end{aligned}$$

We call t an *absorption term*, and denote absorption by $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$.

We also say that B is an absorbing subuniverse of $\mathbf{A}$, that t witnesses the absorption $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$, etc. We call an absorbing subuniverse of a power of $\mathbf{A}$ an *absorbing subpower* of $\mathbf{A}$.

Two absorptions can be witnessed by a common absorption term [5]: If $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$ by a term t and $C \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$ by a term s, then

$$s \star t = s(t(x_{11}, \dots, x_{1n}), \dots, t(x_{m1}, \dots, x_{mn})).$$

is a common absorption term for both $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$ and $C \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$.

As the following well known proposition shows, absorption can be understood as a generalization of near unanimity.

Proposition 4. *A finite idempotent algebra* $\mathbf{A}$ *has an NU term if and only if every singleton absorbs* $\mathbf{A}$*.*

Proof. In one direction, an NU term is an absorption term for any $\{a\} \leq \mathbf{A}$. To obtain the other implication, we repeat the $s \star t$ construction until we arrive at a term n which is an absorption term for every $\{a\} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$. Examining the absorption equations, we see that n satisfies the NU identities for any choice of x, y. □

2.2. **Jónsson absorption.** A weaker, but still useful [4], kind of absorption is Jónsson absorption.

Definition 5. Let $B \leq \mathbf{A}$. We say that B *Jónsson absorbs* $\mathbf{A}$, written $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$, if there exist terms (a *Jónsson absorption chain*) $d_0, d_1, \dots, d_n$ of $\mathbf{A}$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall i = 0, \dots, n,\ d_i(B, A, B) &\subseteq B \\ \forall i = 0, \dots, n-1,\ d_i(x, y, y) &= d_{i+1}(x, x, y) \\ d_0(x, y, z) &= x \\ d_n(x, y, z) &= z. \end{aligned}$$

Note that these terms do not correspond to the standard Jónsson terms, but to directed Jónsson terms introduced in [13]. However, the definition via the original Jónsson terms gives an equivalent concept of Jónsson absorption [13].

Jónsson absorption is weaker than absorption:

Proposition 6. *If* $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$*, then* $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$*.*

Proof. If $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$ by a term $t(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, then the terms

$$\begin{aligned} d_0(x, y, z) &= x \\ d_1(x, y, z) &= t(y, x, x, \dots, x, x) \\ d_2(x, y, z) &= t(z, y, x, \dots, x, x) \\ d_3(x, y, z) &= t(z, z, y, \dots, x, x) \\ &\vdots \\ d_{n-1}(x, y, z) &= t(z, z, z, \dots, z, y) \\ d_n(x, y, z) &= z \end{aligned}$$

witness that $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$. □

The other implication does not hold: Let us define $\mathbf{A}$ as the full idempotent reduct of the implication algebra on $\{0, 1\}$. Here, $\{0\} \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$ is witnessed by the

Jónsson absorbing terms

$$\begin{aligned} d_0(x,y,z) &= x, \\ d_1(x,y,z) &= (y \to (z \to x)) \to x, \\ d_2(x,y,z) &= (x \to (y \to z)) \to z, \\ d_3(x,y,z) &= z. \end{aligned}$$

However, as we will see in Subsection 2.3, $\{0\}$ is not an absorbing subuniverse of $\mathbf{A}$ because this algebra has a $\{0\}$-blocker.

There are numerous parallels between absorption and Jónsson absorption. Similarly to absorption, we have the following result.

Lemma 7. *Assume that $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$ via the sequence of terms $\{d_i\}_{i=0}^{k}$ and $C \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$ by the sequence of terms $\{e_i\}_{i=0}^{l}$. Then there exists a sequence of terms $\{f_i\}_{i=0}^{kl+k}$ that is Jónsson absorbing for both $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$ and $C \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$.*

Proof. It is straightforward to verify that the following chain of terms f_0, f_1, …, $f_{k(\ell+1)}$ will witness both $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$ and $C \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$: For $0 \le a \le k$, $0 \le b \le \ell$, we let

$$f_{a(\ell+1)+b}(x,y,z) = d_a(x, e_b(x,y,z), z).$$

□

Since an algebra generates a congruence distributive variety if and only if it has Jónsson terms [12] if and only if it has directed Jónsson terms [13], we have the following consequence.

Corollary 8. *A finite idempotent algebra $\mathbf{A}$ lies in a congruence distributive variety (equivalently, it has (directed) Jónsson terms) if and only if $\{a\} \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$ for every $a \in A$.*

Now we demonstrate how absorption allows us to transfer connectivity properties to subalgebras.

A subuniverse E of $\mathbf{A}^2$ is often regarded as a digraph (A, E) with vertex set A and edge set E. By a *fence* of length k from a to a' in E we mean a sequence of forward and backward edges in this digraph, that is, a sequence

$$a = e_1, e_2, e_3, \dots, e_k, e_{k+1} = a',$$

where $(e_i, e_{i+1}) \in E$ for i odd, and $(e_{i+1}, e_i) \in E$ for i even. Note that the length of a fence is the number of edges, not vertices.

Lemma 9. *Assume that $\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{F} \le \mathbf{A}^2$, that we have $(a,b), (a',b') \in E$ for some $a, a', b, b' \in A$, that $\mathbf{E} \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{F}$, and that there is a fence of even length from a to a' in F. Then there exists a fence of even length from a to a' in E as well.*

Proof. Let $d_0, d_1, \dots, d_n$ be a Jónsson absorbing chain witnessing $\mathbf{E} \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{F}$. For each i in $1, \dots, n-1$, we construct an even legth fence from $d_i(a,a,a')$ to $d_i(a,a',a')$. Since $d_i(a,a',a') = d_{i+1}(a,a,a')$, we can then concatenate those fences to obtain a long fence from $d_1(a,a,a') = a$ to $d_{n-1}(a,a',a') = a'$.

Let $a, f_2, f_3, \dots, f_{k-1}, a'$ be a fence from a to a' in F. Consider the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b & a & b & \dots & b & a \\ a & f_2 & f_3 & f_4 & \dots & f_{k-1} & a' \\ a' & b' & a' & b' & \dots & b' & a' \end{pmatrix}.$$



FIGURE 1. The situation in Lemma 9 for $k = 4$. The solid lines correspond to tuples from E, while the dotted lines denote tuples in F.

The top and bottom rows are fences in E, the middle row is a fence in F. Applying d_i to the columns of this matrix and using $\mathbf{E} \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{F}$, we get a fence in E from $d_i(a, a, a')$ to $d_i(a, a', a')$, as required. □

By replacing fences by directed paths and using the same construction, we get the following lemma.

Lemma 10. *Assume that $\mathbf{E}, \mathbf{F} \leq \mathbf{A}^2$, that $(a, a), (b, b) \in E$ for some $a, b \in A$, that $\mathbf{E} \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{F}$, and that there is a directed path from a to b in the digraph (A, F). Then there exists a directed path from a to b in (A, E) as well.*

2.2.1. *Absorption and pp-definitions.* It is well known that the set of subpowers of an algebra is closed under primitive positive (pp-) definitions. The following lemma is a version of this fact for absorption and Jónsson absorption.

Lemma 11. *Assume that a subpower R of $\mathbf{A}$ is defined by*

$$R = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \colon \exists y_1, \dots, y_m,\ R_1(\sigma_1) \wedge R_2(\sigma_2) \wedge \dots \wedge R_k(\sigma_k)\},$$

where $R_1, \dots, R_k$ are subpowers of $\mathbf{A}$ regarded as predicates and $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k$ stand for sequences of (free or bound) variables. Let $S_1, \dots, S_k$ be subpowers of $\mathbf{A}$ such that $S_i \trianglelefteq \mathbf{R}_i$ (resp. $S_i \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{R}_i$) for all i. Then the subpower

$$S = \{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \colon \exists y_1, \dots, y_m,\ S_1(\sigma_1) \wedge S_2(\sigma_2) \wedge \dots \wedge S_k(\sigma_k)\},$$

absorbs (resp. Jónsson absorbs) $\mathbf{R}$.

Proof. Let t be a k-ary common absorption term for all $S_i \trianglelefteq \mathbf{R}_i$ (see the remark above Proposition 4 and Lemma 7). We show that t is also an absorption term for $S \trianglelefteq \mathbf{R}$. For simplicity, we verify this fact only in the case when the exceptional argument of t is the last one. So, assume that $r_{i,j}$ are members of A such that $(r_{j,1}, \dots, r_{j,n}) \in S$ for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ and $(r_{k,1}, \dots, r_{k,n}) \in R$. Examining the formulas for S and R, we see that for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, k-1$ there exist $y_{j,1}, \dots, y_{j,m}$ so that $(r_{j,1}, \dots, r_{j,n}, y_{j,1}, \dots, y_{j,m})$ satisfy the conjunction $S_1(\sigma_1) \wedge S_2(\sigma_2) \wedge \dots \wedge S_k(\sigma_k)$, while for $j = k$ we have $y_{k,1}, \dots, y_{k,m}$ such that $(r_{k,1}, \dots, r_{k,n}, y_{k,1}, \dots, y_{k,m})$ satisfy $R_1(\sigma_1) \wedge R_2(\sigma_2) \wedge \dots \wedge R_k(\sigma_k)$.

We consider the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} r_{1,1} & r_{1,2} & \dots & r_{1,n-1} & r_{1,n} & y_{1,1} & y_{1,2} & \dots & y_{1,m} \\ r_{2,1} & r_{2,2} & \dots & r_{2,n-1} & r_{2,n} & y_{2,1} & y_{2,2} & \dots & y_{2,m} \\ & & \vdots & & & & & & \\ r_{k,1} & r_{k,2} & \dots & r_{k,n-1} & r_{k,n} & y_{k,1} & y_{k,2} & \dots & y_{k,m} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Applying t to the columns of this matrix yields a tuple $(s_1, \dots, s_n, y'_1, \dots, y'_m)$. Using $S_i \trianglelefteq \mathbf{R}_i$, it is straightforward to show that this tuple satisfies each conjunct $S_i(\sigma_i)$ of the formula $S_1(\sigma_1) \wedge \ldots \wedge S_k(\sigma_k)$.

The proof for Jónsson absorption is similar. □

Since we can use the above lemma in the case when $\mathbf{R}_i = \mathbf{A}^n$, we immediately obtain that the set of (Jónsson) absorbing subpowers of a given algebra is closed under primitive positive definitions, as long as those definitions do not use the equality relation. There is a good reason for excluding the equality relation:

Proposition 12. *Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a finite algebra, $|A| > 1$. Then the relation $\Delta = \{(a, a) \colon a \in A\}$ is never a Jónsson absorbing subpower of $\mathbf{A}$.*

Proof. Assume that there is a chain $d_0, \dots, d_n$ of Jónsson absorbing terms for $\Delta \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}^2$. Then for every a, b, c, d in A and each d_i we have

$$d_i\left(\begin{pmatrix} a \\ a \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} b \\ c \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} d \\ d \end{pmatrix}\right) \in \Delta.$$

Written in a different way, $d_i(a, b, d) = d_i(a, c, d)$ for all a, b, c, d. That is, d_i does not depend on its second input. But then from the equations $d_i(x, y, y) = d_{i+1}(x, x, y)$ we get $x = d_0(x, y, z) = d_1(x, y, z) = \dots = d_n(x, y, z) = z$, so the algebra $\mathbf{A}$ must be trivial. □

2.3. **Witnessing lack of absorption.** By Proposition 6, one way to witness that B does not absorb $\mathbf{A}$ is to show that B does not Jónsson absorb $\mathbf{A}$. Another way is to find a B-blocker, which is a special kind of a cube term blocker, introduced in [16]:

Definition 13. Let $B \leq \mathbf{A}$. We say that (C, D) is a *B-blocker* of $\mathbf{A}$ if

(1) $D \leq \mathbf{A}$,
(2) $\emptyset \neq C \subseteq D$,
(3) $C \cap B = \emptyset$,
(4) $D \cap B \neq \emptyset$, and
(5) $\forall n, D^n \setminus (D \setminus C)^n \leq \mathbf{A}^n$ (see Figure 2).

Observe that the last property for $n = 1$ says that C is a subuniverse of $\mathbf{A}$.

We remark that (C, D) is a cube term blocker in the sense of [16] if and only if it is a $\{b\}$-blocker for some $b \in A$.

Proposition 14. *Let $B \leq \mathbf{A}$. If $\mathbf{A}$ has a B-blocker, then B does not absorb $\mathbf{A}$.*



FIGURE 2. The relations $D^n \setminus (D \setminus C)^n$ (square with a corner cut off) and $(B \cap D)^n$ (disc) for $n = 2$.

Proof. Assume that there exists a B-blocker (C, D), but $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$ by an n-ary term t. Let c be some member of C and d a member of $D \cap B$. Consider the $n \times n$ matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} c & d & d & \dots & d & d \\ d & c & d & \dots & d & d \\ d & d & c & \dots & d & d \\ & \vdots & & & & \\ d & d & d & \dots & c & d \\ d & d & d & \dots & d & c \end{pmatrix}.$$

Each row lies in $D^n \setminus (D \setminus C)^n \leq \mathbf{A}^n$, therefore t applied to the columns is an n-tuple $\overline{a}$ from $D^n \setminus (D \setminus C)^n$. But each column consists of elements in $D \leq \mathbf{A}$ and all but one of the entries in each column are from $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$. It follows that $\overline{a} \in (B \cap D)^n \subseteq (D \setminus C)^n$, a contradiction. □

The absence of B-blockers by itself does not guarantee that B is absorbing: Consider the full idempotent reduct $\mathbf{A}$ of the group $\mathbb{Z}_2$ and choose $B = \{0\}$. Since $\mathbb{Z}_2$ has a Malcev term $m(x, y, z) = x + y + z \pmod 2$, there is no B-blocker of $\mathbf{A}$. However, were some $t(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum a_i x_i$ an absorption term for $\{0\} \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$, we would run into trouble when trying to satisfy the following set of equalities simultaneously:

$$\begin{aligned} t(1, 0, 0, \dots, 0) &= 0, \\ t(0, 1, 0, \dots, 0) &= 0, \\ t(0, 0, 1, \dots, 0) &= 0, \\ &\vdots \\ t(0, 0, 0, \dots, 1) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

The only linear term that satisfies these equalities is the constant zero term, which is not idempotent.

In the arguments to come, it will be useful to have a description of absorption that talks about subpowers rather then terms. If $J \subseteq I$ are sets of indices and $R \leq \mathbf{A}^I$, we denote by $\pi_{\widehat{J}}(R)$ the projection of R onto the coordinates in $I \setminus J$. For $J = \{j\}$, we write simply $\pi_{\widehat{j}}(R)$.

Definition 15. A subuniverse R of $\mathbf{A}^k$ is called *B-essential* if $R \cap B^k = \emptyset$ and, for every $i = 1, 2, \dots k$, we have $\pi_{\widehat{i}}(R) \cap B^{k-1} \neq \emptyset$.

Observe that if $R \leq \mathbf{A}^k$ is B-essential, then by fixing the first coordinate to B, that is, by defining

$$\{(a_2, \dots, a_k) \colon \exists b \in B,\, (b, a_2, \dots, a_k) \in R\},$$

we get a B-essential subuniverse of $\mathbf{A}^{k-1}$. Therefore, the set of arities of B-essential subpowers of an algebra is a downset in $\mathbb{N}$.

Proposition 16. *Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a finite algebra and $B \leq \mathbf{A}$. Then $\mathbf{A}$ has a k-ary absorption term witnessing $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$ if and only if $\mathbf{A}$ has no k-ary essential subpower. In particular, $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$ if and only if there exists a k such that $\mathbf{A}$ has no k-ary essential subower.*

Proof. Assume that $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$ by a k-ary absorption term t and assume that $R \leq \mathbf{A}^k$ satisfies $\forall i, \pi_{\widehat{i}}(R) \cap B^{k-1} \neq \emptyset$. Then there exist $b_{ij} \in B$ and $a_i \in A$ so that the rows of the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_1 & b_{1,2} & b_{1,3} & \dots & b_{1,k} \\ b_{2,1} & a_2 & b_{2,3} & \dots & b_{2,k} \\ b_{2,1} & b_{2,2} & a_3 & \dots & b_{2,k} \\ & & & \ddots & \\ b_{k,1} & b_{k,2} & b_{k,3} & \dots & a_k \end{pmatrix}$$

are all in R. By applying t component-wise to the colums of this matrix, we get a k-tuple that lies in $R \cap B^k$. Consequently, $\mathbf{A}$ has no B-essential subpower of arity k.

The other implication is more interesting. Let $B \leq \mathbf{A}$ and assume that $\mathbf{A}$ has no k-ary essential subpower. We shall show how to produce a k-ary absorption term.

We begin by extending the above statement to a bigger family of subpowers: Assume that n is a positive integer, $R \leq \mathbf{A}^n$ and that there exists a family of pairwise disjoint sets $I_1, \dots, I_k \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ such that $\pi_{\widehat{I_j}}(R) \cap B^{n-|I_j|} \neq \emptyset$. We claim that then $R \cap B^n \neq \emptyset$. This can be easily proved by induction on n: For $n < k$, the claim is trivial, while the case $n = k$ is equivalent to saying that $\mathbf{A}$ has no k-ary essential subpower. Assume now that the claim holds for $n - 1$ and show how to extend it to n: By the induction hypothesis, the relation $\pi_{\widehat{i}}(R)$ intersects with B^{n-1} for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, so if $B^n \cap R = \emptyset$, then R is an n-ary B-essential relation. However, the set of arities of B-essential relations is a downset and we know that there is no k-ary B-essential relation, so R cannot be B-essential and we get $B^n \cap R \neq \emptyset$.

Consider now the $k|B|^{k-1}(|A| - |B|)$-ary relation

$$R = \{(t(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k))_{(e_1,\dots,e_k)\in I} \colon t \text{ is a } k\text{-ary term of } \mathbf{A}\},$$

where I is the set of all k-tuples $(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_k) \in A^k$ that contain exactly one member of $A \setminus B$ and the remaining elements are from B.

From the definition of R it follows that R is a subuniverse of $\mathbf{A}^I$. Moreover, if we let $I_j = \{(e_1, \dots, e_n) \colon e_j \in A \setminus B, \forall i \neq j,\, e_i \in B\}$, we obtain a partition of I such that $\pi_{\widehat{I_j}}(R) \cap B^{I \setminus I_j} \neq \emptyset$ (consider the operation of projection to the j-th coordinate). Therefore, by the previous claim, R contains a tuple consisting entirely of elements of B. This tuple corresponds to a k-ary absorption term for $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$. □

It will be convenient to extend the notion of B-essential subpower to countably infinitary powers: A subuniverse R of $\mathbf{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is called B-essential if $R \cap B^{\mathbb{N}} = \emptyset$ and, for every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\pi_{\widehat{i}}(R) \cap B^{\mathbb{N}} \neq \emptyset$.

3. Absorption = Jónsson absorption + no B-blockers

We are ready to prove the main result, Theorem 2. The implication (i) ⇒ (ii) follows from Proposition 6 and Proposition 14. Therefore, it is enough to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 17. *Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a finite idempotent algebra, $B \leq \mathbf{A}$, $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$, and assume that $\mathbf{A}$ has no B-blocker. Then $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$.*

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of the above statement. We take a counterexample to the theorem with $|A|$ minimal. Thus B is a subuniverse of $\mathbf{A}$, $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$, $\mathbf{A}$ has no B-blocker, B does not absorb $\mathbf{A}$, and $\mathbf{A}$ is of minimal size among algebras with such a subuniverse B.

By Proposition 16, there are B-essential subpowers of $\mathbf{A}$ of arbitrary large arity. We will show that $\mathbf{A}$ has a family of highly symmetric B-essential subpowers of countably infinite arity, which we use to produce a B-blocker of $\mathbf{A}$.

We begin by showing that the B-essential relations can be chosen to be of a rather special kind. In the following sequence of lemmas, we will be using two wild card symbols: The letter α stands for any suitable member of A and β stands for any suitable member of B. As an example, the meaning of the statement "$(\beta, \beta) \in R$" is "there exist $b_1, b_2 \in B$ (which can be equal or different) such that $(b_1, b_2) \in R$".

Lemma 18. *There exists a function $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ such that if $\mathbf{A}$ has an $f(N)$-ary B-essential subpower, then there exist $b_1, b_2 \in B$ and $a_1, \dots, a_N \in A$ such that the subuniverse of $\mathbf{A}^N$ generated by the N-tuples*

$$\begin{aligned}
&(a_1, b_2, b_2, b_2, \dots, b_2, b_2)\\
&(b_1, a_2, b_2, b_2, \dots, b_2, b_2)\\
&(b_1, b_1, a_3, b_2, \dots, b_2, b_2)\\
&\qquad\vdots\\
&(b_1, b_1, b_1, b_1, \dots, a_{N-1}, b_2)\\
&(b_1, b_1, b_1, b_1, \dots, b_1, a_N).
\end{aligned}$$

is also B-essential.

Proof. This is a Ramsey-type theorem and we will use Ramsey's theorem (see eg. [20, Theorem 3.3]) to prove it. Given N, we choose the number $f(N)$ so that whenever we have a complete symmetric graph $\mathbb{G}$ with at least $f(N)$ vertices whose edges have been colored by $|B|^2$ colors, then there is a monochromatic complete subgraph of $\mathbb{G}$ with at least N vertices.

Suppose that S is a B-essential subpower of $\mathbf{A}$ of arity $f(N)$. For every i from 1 to N, we pick a tuple in S that witnesses $\pi_{\widehat{i}}(S) \cap B^{N-1} \neq \emptyset$, and write these tuples as rows of an $f(N) \times f(N)$ matrix M. Using the wild cards α and β, we know that M has the form

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta & \beta & \dots & \beta \\ \beta & \alpha & \beta & \dots & \beta \\ \beta & \beta & \alpha & \dots & \beta \\ & & \vdots & & \\ \beta & \beta & \beta & \dots & \alpha \end{pmatrix}.$$

We will denote by M_{ij} the entry of M in the i-th row and j-th column. We now take the complete graph $\mathbb{G}$ with the vertex set $\{1, 2, \dots, f(N)\}$ and color the edge between i and j, where $i < j$, by the pair (M_{ij}, M_{ji}). By Ramsey's theorem, there exists a set of indices I of size N such that the subgraph of $\mathbb{G}$ induced by I has monochromatic edges. What does this mean for M? If we look only at the rows and columns of M with indices in I, we get an $N \times N$ submatrix of M that looks like

$$M' = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & b_2 & b_2 & \dots & b_2 \\ b_1 & a_2 & b_2 & \dots & b_2 \\ b_1 & b_1 & a_3 & \dots & b_2 \\ & & \vdots & & \\ b_1 & b_1 & b_1 & \dots & a_N \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $b_1, b_2 \in B$. The rows of M' have exactly the right form for the conclusion of the lemma. To finish the proof, we claim that the rows of M' generate a B-essential subpower T of $\mathbf{A}$.

The generators themselves ensure that $\pi_{\widehat{i}}(T) \cap B^{N-1} \neq \emptyset$. Since we have obtained M' by restricting M to indices $I \times I$, the relation T is a subset of the subpower

$$\pi_I(S \cap \{(s_1, \dots, s_{f(N)}) \colon s_i \in B \text{ for all } i \notin I\}),$$

which means that $T \cap B^N = \emptyset$, and T is B-essential. □

Lemma 19. *For every $K \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $a \in A$ and $b \in B$ such that the subuniverse of $\mathbf{A}^K$ generated by the tuples*

$$\begin{matrix} (a, & b, & \dots, & b, & b) \\ (b, & a, & \dots, & b, & b) \\ & & \ddots & & \\ (b, & b, & \dots, & a, & b) \\ (b, & b, & \dots, & b, & a) \end{matrix}$$

is B-essential.

Proof. First observe that it is enough to find $b \in B$ such that for some $a_1, \dots, a_{|A|K}$, the $|A|K$-ary subpower S of $\mathbf{A}$ generated by tuples of the form

$$\begin{matrix} (a_1, & b, & \dots, & b, & b) \\ (b, & a_2, & \dots, & b, & b) \\ & & \ddots & & \\ (b, & b, & \dots, & a_{|A|K-1}, & b) \\ (b, & b, & \dots, & b, & a_{|A|K}) \end{matrix}$$

is B-essential. Indeed, by the Dirichlet principle, there has to be some $a \in A$ that appears at least K times on the main diagonal of the above matrix. Assume without loss of generality that this a appears in the first K columns of the diagonal. We now take the K-ary relation $T \leq \mathbf{A}^K$ generated by the first K elements of the first K rows of the matrix of generators of S, that is, T is generated by

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (a, & b, & \dots, & b, & b) \\ (b, & a, & \dots, & b, & b) \\ & & \ddots & & \\ (b, & b, & \dots, & a, & b) \\ (b, & b, & \dots, & b, & a) \end{array}$$

As in the proof of Lemma 18, T turns out to be B-essential.

The idea for the remainder of the proof is to force b_1, b_2 from Lemma 18 to be equal. To this end, we call a pair $(b_1, b_2) \in B^2$ *good* if for $N = |\langle b_1, b_2 \rangle|(|A|K + 1)$ there exist $a_1, \dots, a_N \in A$ such that the N-ary subpower R of $\mathbf{A}$ generated by the tuples

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc} (a_1, & b_2, & b_2, & b_2, & \dots, & b_2, & b_2), \\ (b_1, & a_2, & b_2, & b_2, & \dots, & b_2, & b_2), \\ (b_1, & b_1, & a_3, & b_2, & \dots, & b_2, & b_2), \\ & & & & \ddots & & \\ (b_1, & b_1, & b_1, & b_1, & \dots, & a_{N-1}, & b_2), \\ (b_1, & b_1, & b_1, & b_1, & \dots, & b_1, & a_N) \end{array}$$

is B-essential. Since $\mathbf{A}$ has B-essential relations of all arities, Lemma 18 gives us a pair $(b_1, b_2) \in B^2$ that works for some $N \geq |\langle b_1, b_2 \rangle|(|A|K + 1)$. By fixing coordinates, we get that (b_1, b_2) is a good pair. We now take a good pair (b_1, b_2) for which $n = |\langle b_1, b_2 \rangle|$ is minimal. If $n = 1$, then $b_1 = b_2$ and we are done.

In the rest of the proof, we show that if $n > 1$, then there exists a good pair (b_1, b_2) such that $|\langle b_1, b_2 \rangle| < n$.

Consider the digraph $\mathbb{G} = (B, E)$ with the vertex set B, where we let $(i, j) \in E$ if and only if for every choice of k from 0 to $|A|K - 1$ and ℓ from 0 to $(n-1)(|A|K + 1) - 1$, we have

$$(\underbrace{b_1, \dots, b_1}_{k}, \alpha, \underbrace{i, i, \dots, i}_{|A|K-1-k}, \beta, \underbrace{j, j, \dots, j}_{(n-1)(|A|K+1)-1-\ell}, \alpha, \underbrace{b_2, \dots, b_2}_{\ell}) \in R.$$

Since R contains the tuples $(b_1, \dots, b_1, a_r, b_2, \dots, b_2)$, the digraph $\mathbb{G}$ has loops around b_1 and b_2. We claim that there exists a directed path from b_1 to b_2 in $\mathbb{G}$. Why is that the case? Define a binary relation F so that $(i, j) \in F$ if and only if

$$(\underbrace{b_1, \dots, b_1}_{k}, \alpha, \underbrace{i, i, \dots, i}_{|A|K-1-k}, \alpha, \underbrace{j, j, \dots, j}_{(n-1)(|A|K+1)-1-\ell}, \alpha, \underbrace{b_2, \dots, b_2}_{\ell}) \in R,$$

where as before k ranges from 0 to $|A|K - 1$ while ℓ ranges from 0 to $(n-1)(|A|K + 1) - 1$. (The only difference between E and F is that we have replaced β by α on the position $|A|K + 1$ of the long tuple.) Both E and F are clearly subuniverses of $\mathbf{A}^2$.

Since $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$, Lemma 11 tells us that $E \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{F}$.



FIGURE 3. Obtaining b_3.

Since $(b_1, \dots, b_1, a_{|A|K+1}, b_2, \dots, b_2) \in R$, we have $(b_1, b_2) \in F$. By Lemma 10, there is a directed path from b_1 to b_2 in $\mathbb{G}$. Denote the length of the shortest such path by m. Since $b_1 \neq b_2$, we have $m > 0$.

Let b_3 be the second vertex on the shortest directed path from b_1 to b_2 in $\mathbb{G}$ (see Figure 3). Now consider the set B' of vertices of $\mathbb{G}$ that can be reached from b_2 by going backwards $m-1$ times. Since E is a subpower of $\mathbf{B}$, B' is a subuniverse of $\mathbf{B}$. Moreover, B' contains b_2 (because of the loop $(b_2, b_2) \in E$), as well as b_3, and B' does not contain b_1 (else our path would not be minimal). We therefore have $|\langle b_2, b_3 \rangle| \leq |B'| < n$. We now show that at least one of (b_1, b_1) or (b_3, b_2) is a good pair.

To that end, consider the relation

$$S = \{(s_1, \dots, s_{|A|K}) \colon (s_1, \dots, s_{|A|K}, \beta, \beta, \dots, \beta) \in R\}.$$

It is straightforward to show that S is a subpower of $\mathbf{A}$ and that S is B-essential of arity $|A|K$. If we can find $(b_1, \dots, b_1, \alpha, b_1, \dots, b_1) \in S$ for α in every position, then (b_1, b_1) is good and we are done.

Assume therefore, that there exists a k such that

$$(\underbrace{b_1, \dots, b_1}_{k}, \alpha, \underbrace{b_1, \dots, b_1}_{|A|K-k-1}) \notin S.$$

Going back to the definition of S, we see that this is only possible if for this value of k we have

$$(\underbrace{b_1, \dots, b_1}_{k}, \alpha, \underbrace{b_1, \dots, b_1}_{|A|K-k-1}, \underbrace{\beta, \dots\dots\dots, \beta}_{(n-1)(|A|K+1)+1}) \notin R.$$

Consider the relation

$$U = \{(u_1, \dots, u_{(n-1)(|A|K+1)}) \colon (\underbrace{b_1, \dots, b_1}_{k}, \alpha, \underbrace{b_1, \dots, b_1}_{|A|K-k-1}, \beta, u_1, \dots, u_{(n-1)(|A|K+1)}) \in R\}.$$

This is an $(n-1)(|A|K+1)$-ary subpower of $\mathbf{A}$ that is disjoint from $B^{(n-1)(|A|K+1)}$. Since (b_1, b_3) is an edge in $\mathbb{G}$, we have

$$(\underbrace{b_1, \dots, b_1}_{k}, \alpha, \underbrace{b_1, \dots, b_1}_{|A|K-k-1}, \beta, \underbrace{b_3, \dots\dots\dots\dots, b_3}_{(n-1)(|A|K+1)-\ell-1}, \alpha, \underbrace{b_2, \dots, b_2}_{\ell}) \in R$$

for every ℓ from 0 to $(n-1)(|A|K+1)-1$. Therefore, U contains for every applicable ℓ a tuple of the form

$$(\underbrace{b_3, \dots\dots\dots\dots, b_3}_{(n-1)(|A|K+1)-\ell-1}, \alpha, \underbrace{b_2, \dots, b_2}_{\ell}).$$

We see that U is a B-essential relation of arity $(n-1)(|A|K+1)$ and $|\langle b_2, b_3\rangle| \leq n-1$. By fixing some coordinates of U to b_3 to decrease the arity of U, we get a $(|\langle b_2, b_3\rangle|(|A|K+1))$-ary B-essential subpower U' of $\mathbf{A}$ that contains for each ℓ a tuple of the form

$$(b_3, \dots\dots\dots, b_3, \alpha, \underbrace{b_2, \dots, b_2}_{\ell}).$$

We can thus replace the pair (b_1, b_2) by (b_3, b_2) as we needed. □

Since there are only finitely many choices of a, b and infinitely many choices of K, we can apply Dirichlet's principle to make Lemma 19 stronger:

Corollary 20. *There exist $a \in A, b \in B$ such that, for every $K \in \mathbb{N}$, the subuniverse of $\mathbf{A}^K$ generated by*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} (a, & b, & \dots, & b, & b) \\ (b, & a, & \dots, & b, & b) \\ & & \ddots & & \\ (b, & b, & \dots, & a, & b) \\ (b, & b, & \dots, & b, & a) \end{array}$$

is B-essential.

For the remainder of the proof, we fix a pair of elements $a, b \in A$ from Corollary 20. It is an easy exercise to show that the (countably) infinitary subpower of $\mathbf{A}$ generated by

$$(a, b, b, b, \dots), (b, a, b, b, \dots), \dots$$

is B-essential. We denote this relation by R_∞.

We say that a relation R is *symmetric*, if it is invariant under all permutations of coordinates. Given a k-ary relation $T \leq \mathbf{A}^k$, we construct an infinitary subpower S_T of $\mathbf{A}$ by fixing the first k coordinates of R_∞ to members of T:

$$S_T = \{(s_1, s_2, \dots) \colon \exists (t_1, \dots, t_k) \in T,\ (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_k, s_1, s_2, \dots) \in R_\infty\}.$$

For $k = 0$, we define $S_{A^0} = R_\infty$.

From the choice of generators and the idempotency of $\mathbf{A}$ we obtain the following observation.

Lemma 21. *For every choice of T, S_T is symmetric and only finitely many coordinates of any element of S_T are different from b.*

By fixing all but the first two coordinates of S_T to elements of B we obtain the binary relation

$$S_{T;1,2} = \{(x, y) \colon (x, y, \beta, \beta, \beta, \dots) \in S_T\} \leq \mathbf{A}^2.$$

This (symmetric) binary relation defines a graph with the vertex set A. We denote the neighborhood of the set B in this graph by $B^{+S_{T;1,2}}$:

$$B^{+S_{T;1,2}} = \{c \in A \colon (\beta, c) \in S_{T;1,2}\} = \{c \in A \colon (c, \beta) \in S_{T;1,2}\} \leq \mathbf{A}.$$



FIGURE 4. Three stages of the proof that $S_{T;1,2} = A^2 \setminus (A \setminus C)^2$. Solid lines denote pairs in $S_{T;1,2}$ while the dashed line stands for the relation $S^{\star}_{T;1,2}$.

For some choices of k and T (such as $k = 0$), the relation S_T is B-essential. We choose a subpower T of $\mathbf{A}$ so that S_T is B-essential and the size of the set $B^{+S_{T;1,2}}$ is maximal. We put $C = B^{+S_{T;1,2}}$ and show that (C, A) is a B-blocker. This will contradict the choice of $B \leq \mathbf{A}$ and finish the proof.

The subuniverse C is nonempty and disjoint from B as S_T is B-essential. Except for the condition (5), it is easy to verify that (C, A) satisfies all conditions of Definition 13. We use a chain of lemmas to show that $A^n \setminus (A \setminus C)^n$ is a subpower of $\mathbf{A}$ for all choices of n.

Lemma 22. *If $c \in C$, then $(b, c), (c, b) \in S_{T;1,2}$ and $\langle b, c\rangle = A$ (where $\langle b, c\rangle$ denotes the subuniverse of A generated by b and c).*

Proof. From Lemma 21 and the choice of C it follows that both (b, c) and (c, b) are in $S_{T;1,2}$.

To prove the second claim we show that $\langle b, c\rangle \subsetneq A$ leads to a contradiction. Let $\mathbf{A}'$ be the subalgebra of $\mathbf{A}$ with universe $A' = \langle b, c\rangle$ and $B' = B \cap \langle b, c\rangle$. Clearly, B' is a Jónsson absorbing subuniverse of $\mathbf{A}'$. We also know that $\mathbf{A}'$ has no B'-blockers, since every B'-blocker in $\mathbf{A}'$ is also a B-blocker in $\mathbf{A}$.

Since $\mathbf{A}'$ is smaller than $\mathbf{A}$ and we assume $\mathbf{A}$ to be a minimial counterexample to Theorem 17, B' absorbs $\mathbf{A}'$. Call the absorbing term t and let k be its arity. Since $c \in B^{+S_{T;1,2}}$, S_T contains a tuple of the form $(c, \beta, \beta, \dots)$ which we can write as $(c, \beta, \dots, \beta, b, b, \dots)$ by Lemma 21. Therefore, by fixing some coordinates of S_T to B, we obtain a symmetric B-essential subuniverse Q of $\mathbf{A}^{\mathbb{N}}$ containing all permutations of the tuple $(c, b, b, \dots)$. If we now apply t to k of these tuples like in the proof of Proposition 16, we get that $Q \cap (B')^{\mathbb{N}} \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction with Q being B-essential. The only way to avoid this contradiction is if $\langle b, c\rangle = A$. □

Next we verify that $A^n \setminus (A \setminus C)^n \leq \mathbf{A}$ for $n = 2$.

Lemma 23. *If we choose T and C as above, then $S_{T;1,2} = A^2 \setminus (A \setminus C)^2$.*

Proof. We begin our proof by showing that $C^2 \cap S_{T;1,2} \neq \emptyset$. Assume for a contradiction that the subuniverse $C^{+S_{T;1,2}} = \{e \in A \colon \exists c \in C, (e,c) \in S_{T;1,2}\}$ of $\mathbf{A}$ is disjoint from C. Let $T' = T \times C^{+S_{T;1,2}}$ and consider the corresponding relation $S_{T'}$. We claim that $S_{T'}$ is a B-essential subpower of $\mathbf{A}$ and that $B^{+S_{T';1,2}}$ is strictly larger than C. This will contradict the choice of T and C.

Why is $S_{T'}$ a B-essential relation? Were there $(\beta, \beta, \dots) \in S_{T'}$, we would have $(c, \beta, \beta, \dots) \in S_T$ for some $c \in C^{+S_{T;1,2}}$. But then c would belong to C, a contradiction with $C \cap C^{+S_{T;1,2}} = \emptyset$. On the other hand, from $b \in C^{+S_{T;1,2}}$ it follows that the projection of $S_{T'}$ onto all but one coordinates intersects $B^{\mathbb{N}}$.

It remains to show that $C \subsetneq B^{+S_{T';1,2}}$. First of all, if $g \in C$, then $(b, g, \beta, \dots, \beta) \in S_T$ by Lemma 22. Using $b \in C^{+S_{T;1,2}}$ then gives us $g \in B^{+S_{T';1,2}}$, so we have $C \subseteq B^{+S_{T';1,2}}$.

To see that the inclusion is proper, we need to take a small detour. Choose and fix a $c \in C$. By Lemma 22, we have $(c,b), (b,c) \in S_{T;1,2}$. Consider the relation $S^\star_{T;1,2} = \{(x,y) \colon (x,y,\alpha,\beta,\beta,\dots) \in S_T\} \leq \mathbf{A}^2$. Since $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$, we have $S_{T;1,2} \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{S}^\star_{T;1,2}$ by Lemma 11. The symmetry of S_T gives us $(b,b,c,\beta,\beta,\dots) \in S_T$ so $(b,b) \in S^\star_{T;1,2}$. The sequence c, b, b is thus a fence of even length from c to b in $S^\star_{T;1,2}$ (see Figure 4 left). Lemma 9 then implies that there exists a fence of even length from c to b in $S_{T;1,2}$. To reach b, this fence cannot use only edges in $C \times C^{+S_{T;1,2}}$, so there exist some $d \in C$, $e \in C^{+S_{T;1,2}}$ and $f \in A \setminus C$ such that $(d,e), (f,e) \in S_{T;1,2}$ (see Figure 4 center). Since S_T is symmetric, we have $(e,f,\beta,\beta,\dots) \in S_T$, from which it follows that $(f,\beta,\dots) \in S_{T'}$. We see that $f \in B^{+S_{T';1,2}} \setminus C$ witnesses $C \subsetneq B^{+S_{T';1,2}}$.

We have shown that $C \cap C^{+S_{T;1,2}} \neq \emptyset$, that is, there exist $d, e \in C$ such that $(d,e) \in S_{T;1,2}$ (see Figure 4 right). The set $\{x \in A \colon (d,x) \in S_{T;1,2}\}$ is a subuniverse of $\mathbf{A}$ (from idempotency) which contains b and e. By the second part of Lemma 22, this subuniverse is equal to A, in other words, $(d,x) \in S_{T;1,2}$ for every $x \in A$. Similarly, $(x,e) \in S_{T;1,2}$ for every $x \in A$. By repeating this argument, we get that the set of neighbors of any $f \in C$ is equal to A, so $S_{T;1,2} \supseteq A \times C \cup C \times A = A^2 \setminus (A \setminus C)^2$.

It remains to verify that there is no edge $(e,f) \in S_{T;1,2}$ connecting vertices $e, f \in A \setminus C$. If we had such an edge, we would let $T' = T \times \{e\}$ and consider $S_{T'}$. Arguments similar to the above give us that $S_{T'}$ is a B-essential relation and $B^{+S_{T';1,2}} \supseteq C \cup \{f\}$, a contradiction with the maximality of C. □

To finish the proof of item (5) in Definition 13, we need to generalize $S_{T;1,2}$ to higher arities. Denote by $S_{T;1,2,\dots,n}$ the relation

$$\{(s_1, \dots, s_n) \colon (s_1, \dots, s_n, \beta, \beta, \dots) \in S_T\} \leq \mathbf{A}^n.$$

Lemma 24. *Let S_T be chosen as above (ie. S_T is B-essential and the size of $C = B^{+S_{T;1,2}}$ is maximal). Then $S_{T;1,2,\dots,n} = A^n \setminus (A \setminus C)^n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. Let X_n be the n-ary subpower of $\mathbf{A}$ generated by the tuples (note the extra tuple at the end):

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} (a, & b, & b, & \dots, & b, & b), \\ (b, & a, & b, & \dots, & b, & b), \\ & & & \ddots, & & \\ (b, & b, & b, & \dots, & b, & a), \\ (b, & b, & b, & \dots, & b, & b). \end{array}$$

We prove by induction on n that for every $n \in \{2, 3, \dots\}$ we have $S_{T;1,2,\dots,n} = A^n \setminus (A \setminus C)^n$ and $X_{n-1} = A^{n-1}$.

The claim holds for $n = 2$ by the previous lemma (to see that $X_1 = \langle a, b\rangle = A$, use the minimality of $\mathbf{A}$ as in the proof of Lemma 22). Assume that the claim holds for some n. We show that it holds for $n + 1$.

We first prove $X_n = A^n$. By examining how R_∞ is generated, one sees that X_n contains the whole $S_{T;1,2,\dots,n}$ which is equal to $A^n \setminus (A \setminus C)^n$ by the induction hypothesis. It remains to prove that X_n also contains $(A \setminus C)^n$. Let $(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_n)$ be a tuple with $x_i \in A \setminus C$ for each i. Since $a \in C$, we know that the tuple $(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, a)$ is in X_n. Moreover, it is apparent from the generators that $X_{n-1} \times \{b\} \subseteq X_n$, so the induction hypothesis implies $(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, b) \in X_n$. We have shown that the subuniverse $\{z \colon (x_1, \dots, x_n, z) \in X_n\} \leq \mathbf{A}$ contains a and b, therefore it is equal to $A = \langle a, b\rangle$. In particular, $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in X_n$, as claimed.

We are now ready to show that $S_{T;1,2,\dots,n+1} = A^{n+1} \setminus (A \setminus C)^{n+1}$. We begin with the inclusion "$\supseteq$". Given any $c \in C$, the induction hypothesis gives us that the n-ary tuples $(c, a, b, \dots, b)$ and $(c, b, b, \dots, b)$ lie in $S_{T;1,2,\dots,n}$. Therefore,

$$(c, a, b, \dots, b, \beta, \beta, \dots), (c, b, b, \dots, b, \beta, \beta, \dots) \in S_T.$$

Using Lemma 21 we get

$$(c, a, b, \dots, b, b), (c, b, b, \dots, b, b) \in S_{T;1,2,\dots,n+1}.$$

Since $S_{T;1,2,\dots,n+1}$ is symmetric, it contains all generators of $C \times X_n$, therefore $S_{T;1,2,\dots,n+1} \supseteq C \times X_n = C \times A^n$. One more use of this symmetry then yields $S_{T;1,2,\dots,n+1} \subseteq A^{n+1} \setminus (A \setminus C)^{n+1}$

It remains to prove that $S_{T;1,2,\dots,n+1}$ does not contain any element from $(A \setminus C)^{n+1}$. For a contradiction, assume that $(y_1, \dots, y_{n+1}) \in (A \setminus C)^{n+1} \cap S_{T;1,2,\dots,n+1}$. We use a trick similar to the one we employed when proving Lemma 23: Let $T' = T \times \{(y_1, \dots, y_n)\}$; we claim that $S_{T'}$ is B-essential, and that $B^{+S_{T';1,2}} \supsetneq C$. This will contradict the maximality of C.

The B-essentiality of $S_{T'}$ is seen as follows. Since $(y_1, \dots, y_n, y_{n+1}) \in S_{T;1,2,\dots,n+1}$, we have $(y_{n+1}, \beta, \beta, \dots) \in S_{T'}$. Moreover, were $(\beta, \beta, \dots) \in S_{T'}$, we would have $(y_1, \dots, y_n, \beta, \beta, \dots) \in S_T$. Therefore, $(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in S_{T;1,2,\dots,n} \cap (A \setminus C)^n$ which is impossible by the induction hypothesis.

Let now $c \in C$. Then $(y_1, \dots, y_n, c) \in A^n \times C \subseteq S_{T;1,2,\dots,n+1}$, which gives us $(c, \beta) \in S_{T';1,2}$. Therefore $C \subseteq B^{+S_{T';1,2}}$. Moreover, $y_{n+1} \in B^{+S_{T';1,2}} \setminus C$, making $B^{+S_{T';1,2}}$ strictly larger than C. □

4. Deciding absorption

Armed by Theorem 2, we now show how to algorithmically decide the absorption problem:

Problem 25 (Deciding absorption)**.**
Input: $\mathbf{A}$ finite idempotent algebra with finitely many basic operations (the operations are given by tables of values), $B \leq \mathbf{A}$.
Output: "Yes" if $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$, "No" otherwise.

Note that the size of the input for our problem is not just $|A|$, but $|A|$ plus the tables of all the operations on $|A|$, so for one k-ary operation, the input size is of the order of $|A|^k$. We denote this input size $\|\mathbf{A}\|$.

By Theorem 2, it is enough to decide whether $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$ and if so, whether there are no B-blockers in $\mathbf{A}$. Of these two subproblems, the second is the harder one.

Let us begin by devising a polynomial time algorithm that, given idempotent $\mathbf{A}$ and $B \leq \mathbf{A}$, decides whether $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$. The algorithm is based on the following variant of the result by Ralph Freese and Matt Valeriote [19, Proposition 5.7].

Theorem 26. *Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a finite idempotent algebra and $B \leq \mathbf{A}$. Then $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$ if and only if for every $a, c, d \in A$ and every $b_1, b_2 \in B$, the digraph $\mathbb{G} = (A, E)$ with the edge set*

$$E = \{(u, v) \colon \exists b \in B, (b, u, v) \in \langle (b_1, a, a), (b_2, c, c), (d, a, c) \rangle\}$$

contains a directed path from a to c.

The subuniverse $\langle (b_1, a, a), (b_2, c, c), (d, a, c) \rangle \leq \mathbf{A}^3$ can be visualised as a colored digraph: an element (b, u, v) is regarded as the edge (u, v) colored by b. The theorem asks for a B-colored directed path from a to c.

Proof. If $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$, then applying the Jónsson absorption terms $d_0, d_1, \ldots, d_n$ to the columns of the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} b_1 & a & a \\ d & a & c \\ b_2 & c & c \end{pmatrix}$$

gives us a sequence of $n+1$ triples whose first coordinates are in B and the second and third coordinates form a path in $\mathbb{G}$ from a to c, proving the "only if" implication.

To prove the other, harder, implication, we introduce the property $D(i, j)$, a sort of partial Jónsson absorption:

Definition 27. Denote by $D(i, j)$ the following property: Whenever $\overline{b}_1, \overline{b}_2 \in B^i$, $\overline{d} \in A^i$, $\overline{a}, \overline{c} \in A^j$, and R is the subuniverse of $\mathbf{A}^{i+2j}$ generated by $(\overline{b}_1, \overline{a}, \overline{a})$, $(\overline{b}_2, \overline{c}, \overline{c})$, $(\overline{d}, \overline{a}, \overline{c}) \in R$, then the digraph $\mathbb{H} = (A^j, F)$ with the edge set

$$F = \{(\overline{u}, \overline{v}) \in (A^j)^2 \colon (\overline{\beta}, \overline{u}, \overline{v}) \in R\}$$

contains a directed path from $\overline{a}$ to $\overline{c}$. (We use the wild card $\overline{\beta}$ for "there exists some suitable tuple of elements of B".)

Observe that $D(1, 1)$ is just a reformulation of the "there exists a path" condition from the statement of Theorem 26. We show that $D(1, 1)$ implies $D(i, j)$ for any $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, which will almost immediately give us a Jónsson absorbing chain for $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$.

To show that $\mathbf{A}$ has $D(i, j)$ for any i, j, we need three lemmas.

Lemma 28. *Let $\overline{a}, \overline{b}_1, \overline{b}_2, \overline{c}, \overline{d}$ and R be as in the definition of $D(i, j)$. Then for every $\overline{e} \in \langle \overline{a}, \overline{c} \rangle$, we have*

$$(\overline{\beta}, \overline{e}, \overline{e}),\ (\overline{\alpha}, \overline{a}, \overline{e}),\ (\overline{\alpha}, \overline{e}, \overline{c}) \in R.$$

Proof. Let t be a term of $\mathbf{A}$ such that $\overline{e} = t(\overline{a}, \overline{c})$. We obtain the three tuples we need (in the order listed in the statement of the lemma) by applying t to the columns of the three matrices:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{b}_1 & \overline{a} & \overline{a} \\ \overline{b}_2 & \overline{c} & \overline{c} \end{pmatrix},\ \begin{pmatrix} \overline{b}_1 & \overline{a} & \overline{a} \\ \overline{d} & \overline{a} & \overline{c} \end{pmatrix},\ \begin{pmatrix} \overline{d} & \overline{a} & \overline{c} \\ \overline{b}_2 & \overline{c} & \overline{c} \end{pmatrix}.$$

□



FIGURE 5. Proving Lemma 29. Solid lines represent tuples of R that begin with B^{i+1}, while dashed lines represent tuples of R that begin with $A \times B^i$. The dotted line is the tuple $(\overline{d}, \overline{a}, \overline{c})$.

Lemma 29. *If* $\mathbf{A}$ *satisfies* $D(1,j)$ *and* $D(i,j)$*, then* $\mathbf{A}$ *satisfies* $D(i+1,j)$*.*

Proof. Given $\overline{b}_1, \overline{b}_2 \in B^{i+1}$, $\overline{d} \in A^{i+1}$, $\overline{a}, \overline{c} \in A^j$ and $R = \langle (\overline{b}_1, \overline{a}, \overline{a}), (\overline{b}_2, \overline{c}, \overline{c}), (\overline{d}, \overline{a}, \overline{c}) \rangle \leq \mathbf{A}^{i+1+2j}$, we construct and examine the digraph $\mathbb{H}$ as defined above.

Consider the projection of R onto all its coordinates except the first one. Using $D(i,j)$, we find a sequence $\overline{e}_0, \overline{e}_1, \overline{e}_2, \dots, \overline{e}_k \in A^j$ and a sequence $f_1, \dots, f_k \in A$ such that $\overline{e}_0 = \overline{a}$, $\overline{e}_k = \overline{c}$, and for each $\ell = 1, 2, \dots k$ we have $(f_\ell \overline{\beta}, \overline{e}_{\ell-1}, \overline{e}_\ell) \in R$ (see Figure 5).

For each ℓ, the tuples $\overline{e}_{\ell-1}$ and $\overline{e}_\ell$ are in $\langle \overline{a}, \overline{c} \rangle$, therefore some tuples of the form $(\beta\overline{\beta}, \overline{e}_{\ell-1}, \overline{e}_{\ell-1})$ and $(\beta\overline{\beta}, \overline{e}_\ell, \overline{e}_\ell)$ are in R by Lemma 28. Since $(f_\ell\overline{\beta}, \overline{e}_{\ell-1}, \overline{e}_\ell)$ is in R as well, by applying $D(1,j)$ to the subuniverse $S \leq \mathbf{A}^{1+2j}$ generated by the coordinates $1, i+2, i+3, \dots, i+2j+1$ of the three tuples from this paragraph, we get a B-labelled path from $\overline{e}_{\ell-1}$ to $\overline{e}_\ell$. Notice that S is a subset of

$$\{(u, \overline{v}, \overline{w}) \in A^{1+2j} \colon (u\overline{\beta}, \overline{v}, \overline{w}) \in R\},$$

therefore we can lift this path to a B^{i+1}-labeled path from $\overline{e}_{\ell-1}$ to $\overline{e}_\ell$ in $\mathbb{H}$. Concatenating all these paths, we get a path from $\overline{a}$ to $\overline{c}$ in $\mathbb{H}$, just as we needed. □

Lemma 30. *If* $\mathbf{A}$ *satisfies* $D(i,1)$ *and* $D(i,j)$*, then* $\mathbf{A}$ *satisfies* $D(i,j+1)$*.*

Proof. The idea of the proof is similar to that of Lemma 29, but we will need to use finiteness of $\mathbf{A}$ a bit more: Consider a relation $R \leq \mathbf{A}^{i+2(j+1)}$ together with $\overline{b}_1, \overline{b}_2 \in B^i$, $\overline{d} \in A^i$, and $\overline{a}, \overline{c} \in A^{j+1}$ as in Definition 27 and assume that $R, \overline{a}, \overline{c}$ form a counterexample to $D(i,j+1)$ such that the set $\langle \overline{a}, \overline{c} \rangle$ is inclusion minimal among all possible counterexamples.

Take the projection of R to all indices except for the $(i+1)$-st and $(i+j+1)$-st, and apply $D(i,j)$. This yields an "almost chain" from $\overline{a}$ to $\overline{c}$: A sequence of tuples $\overline{a} = \overline{e}_1, \overline{f}_1, \overline{e}_2 \dots, \overline{e}_k, \overline{f}_k = \overline{c}$ such that for all $\ell = 1, \dots, k-1$ we have $(\overline{\beta}, \overline{f}_\ell, \overline{e}_{\ell+1}) \in R$, and the tuples $\overline{e}_\ell$ and $\overline{f}_\ell$ agree on all coordinates except possibly the first one (see Figure 6).

We now claim that for each ℓ there is a directed path from $\overline{a}$ to $\overline{f}_\ell$ in the digraph $\mathbb{H} = (A^{j+1}, F)$ (see Definition 27). We proceed by induction on ℓ.

For $\ell = 1$, we use Lemma 28 to realize that the tuples $(\overline{\beta}, \overline{a}, \overline{a})$, $(\overline{\beta}, \overline{f}_1, \overline{f}_1)$, and $(\overline{\alpha}, \overline{a}, \overline{f}_1)$ are all in R. Then we can take the projection of R onto the coordinates $1, 2, \dots, i, i+1, i+j+1$, apply $D(i,1)$, and get a path from $\overline{a}$ to $\overline{f}_1$.

The induction step is quite similar: Assume that there is a path from $\overline{a}$ to $\overline{f}_{\ell-1}$, but no path from $\overline{a}$ to $\overline{f}_\ell$. We will show that then there is a path from $\overline{e}_\ell$ to $\overline{f}_\ell$,



FIGURE 6. Proving Lemma 30. Solid lines represent tuples of R that begin with a tuple from B^i; dashed lines represent the relation "these two tuples agree on coordinates 2 through $j+2$". Not pictured: Tuples of the form $(\overline{\alpha}, \overline{a}, \overline{e}_k)$.

which when combined with the path $\overline{a}, \ldots, \overline{f}_{\ell-1}, \overline{e}_\ell$ gives us a path from $\overline{a}$ to $\overline{f}_\ell$ after all.

Lemma 28 shows that the tuples $(\overline{\beta}, \overline{a}, \overline{a})$, $(\overline{\beta}, \overline{f}_\ell, \overline{f}_\ell)$, and $(\overline{\alpha}, \overline{a}, \overline{f}_\ell)$ are in R, so the pair $\overline{a}, \overline{f}_\ell$ witnesses the failure of $D(i, j+1)$. Since we assume that $\langle \overline{a}, \overline{c} \rangle$ is inclusion minimal among all counterexamples to $D(i, j+1)$, we must have $\langle \overline{a}, \overline{f}_\ell \rangle = \langle \overline{a}, \overline{c} \rangle$, so in particular $\overline{e}_\ell \in \langle \overline{a}, \overline{f}_\ell \rangle$. From this, a reasoning similar to Lemma 28 gives us that $(\overline{\alpha}, \overline{e}_\ell, \overline{f}_\ell) \in R$. But then we can project R onto the coordinates $1, 2, \ldots, i, i+1, j+i+1$ and use $D(i, 1)$ on the tuples $(\overline{\beta}, \overline{e}_\ell, \overline{e}_\ell)$, $(\overline{\beta}, \overline{f}_\ell, \overline{f}_\ell)$, and $(\overline{\alpha}, \overline{e}_\ell, \overline{f}_\ell)$ to get a path from $\overline{f}_\ell$ to $\overline{e}_\ell$, as was needed.

To conclude the proof that $\mathbf{A}$ satisfies $D(i, j+1)$, observe that $\overline{f}_k = \overline{c}$, so we have just shown that there is a directed path in $\mathbb{H}$ from $\overline{a}$ to $\overline{c}$. □

We now repeatedly use Lemmas 29 and 30 until we get that $\mathbf{A}$ satisfies $D(|A||B|^2, |A|^2)$. We then consider the three ternary projections π_1, π_2, π_3 as tuples of values; specifically, we evaluate these projections on all tuples from $A \times B \times A$ (the first block of values), on all tuples of the form $\{(x, x, y) \colon x, y \in A\}$ (the second block), and on all tuples of the form $\{(x, y, y) \colon x, y \in A\}$ (the third block). We have three members of $A^{|A||B|^2+2|A|^2}$. Let R be the relation generated by these three tuples. Using $D(|A||B|^2, |A|^2)$ on R, we get a path in the digraph $\mathbb{H}$ that precisely corresponds to a Jónsson absorption chain for $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$. This finishes the proof of Theorem 26 □

Theorem 26 gives us a straightforward algorithm to test whether $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$ for $\mathbf{A}$ idempotent: Try all possible $a, c, d \in A$, $b_1, b_2 \in B$ (there are $O(|A|^5)$ such choices) and for each choice use the three triples $(b_1, a, a), (b_2, c, c), (d, a, c)$ to generate a subuniverse $R \leq \mathbf{A}^3$. Then go through the list of elements of R and find those that have their first coordinate in B, record their last two entries as edges in a new relation $F \subseteq A^2$ and check whether there is a path from a to c in the graph $\mathbb{H} = (A, F)$.

Let us move on to deciding whether $\mathbf{A}$ contains a B-blocker. For this, we make use of ideas from [16]. We start by rewording the definition of a B-blocker:

Lemma 31. *Let $\mathbf{A}$ be a finite idempotent algebra and $B \leq \mathbf{A}$. Then (C, D) is a B-blocker if and only if all the following hold:*

(1) $D \leq \mathbf{A}$,

(2) $\emptyset \neq C \subseteq D$,
(3) $C \cap B = \emptyset$,
(4) $D \cap B \neq \emptyset$, *and*
(5) *for each basic operation* t *of* $\mathbf{A}$*, there exists an index* i *such that*

$$t(D, \dots, D, C, D, \dots, D) \subseteq C,$$

where C *is at the* i*-th coordinate.*

From Lemma 31 it is apparent that, given (C, D), we can test in time polynomial in $\|\mathbf{A}\|$ whether (C, D) is a B-blocker. Thus, deciding B-blockers is in the class NP.

Can we do better? Generally no, since deciding whether $\mathbf{A}$ containts a B-blocker turns out to be NP-hard even when it is guaranteed that $\mathbf{A}$ is idempotent, has directed Jónsson terms, and B is a singleton (thus, in particular, $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$). This is in sharp contrast with deciding the existence of cube term blockers, which can be done in P when $\mathbf{A}$ is idempotent [14].

Problem 32 (Deciding singleton-blockers in idempotent CD algebras)**.**
Input: $\mathbf{A}$ finite idempotent algebra in a congruence distributive variety with finitely many basic operations (the operations are given by tables of values), $b \in A$.
Output: "Yes" if $\mathbf{A}$ contains a $\{b\}$-blocker, "No" otherwise.

Theorem 33. *There is a logarithmic space reduction from 3-SAT to deciding singleton-blockers in idempotent CD algebras.*

Proof. Given a nonempty 3-SAT formula over the variables $w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n$ of the form

$$\psi(w_1, \dots, w_n) = \bigwedge_{j=1}^{m} (\lambda_{j1} \vee \lambda_{j2} \vee \lambda_{j3}),$$

where the λs stand for literals, we consider the algebra $\mathbf{A}$ with the universe $A = \{0, 1, w_1, \dots, w_n\}$, binary basic operations $s_1(x, y), \dots, s_n(x, y)$, ternary basic operations $t_1(x, y, z), \dots, t_m(x, y, z)$, and ternary basic operations $d_1(x, y, z)$ and $d_2(x, y, z)$ (the last two operations will form a directed Jónsson chain).

For each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, let

$$s_i(x, y) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x = y, \\ w_i & \text{if } x = 0,\ y = 1, \\ 1 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

The operations $t_j(x, y, z)$ are defined as follows (note that the rules for t_j depend on the shape of the j-th clause, so only five rules get used for each particular t_j):

$$t_j(x, y, z) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x = y = z \\ w_k & \text{if } \lambda_{j1} = w_k,\ y = z = w_k, \text{ and } x = 1, \\ & \text{or } \lambda_{j2} = w_k,\ x = z = w_k, \text{ and } y = 1, \\ & \text{or } \lambda_{j3} = w_k,\ x = y = w_k, \text{ and } z = 1. \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda_{j1} = \neg w_k,\ x = w_k, \text{ and } y = z = 0, \\ & \text{or } \lambda_{j2} = \neg w_k,\ y = w_k, \text{ and } x = z = 0, \\ & \text{or } \lambda_{j3} = \neg w_k,\ z = w_k, \text{ and } x = y = 0, \\ 1 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Finally, we define d_1 and d_2:

$$d_1(x,y,z) = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x = y \text{ or } x = z \\ 1 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

$$d_2(x,y,z) = \begin{cases} z & \text{if } y = z \text{ or } x = z \\ 1 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Observe that $x = d_1(x,x,y)$, $d_1(x,y,y) = d_2(x,x,y)$, $d_2(x,y,y) = y$, and $d_1(x,y,x) = d_2(x,y,x) = x$ for all $x, y \in A$, so x, d_1, d_2, z is a chain of directed Jónsson terms, so $\mathbf{A}$ lies in a congruence distributive variety.

We now claim that $\mathbf{A}$ has a $\{0\}$-blocker (C,D) if and only if the the formula ψ is satisfiable.

Assume first that there is a satisfying assignment e for ψ. We put $D = A$ and make C consist of precisely the element 1 and all variables w_i such that $e(w_i) = \text{True}$ (in particular, $0 \notin C$). We show that (C,D) satisfies all conditions from Lemma 31. Of these conditions, only item (5) is not immediately clear.

For each i and each $c \in C$, we have $s_i(\{c\}, A) \subseteq \{1, c\} \subseteq C$, so the blocker condition is satisfied for these operations. Similarly, we get $d_1(C,A,A)$, $d_2(A,A,C) \subseteq C$ because C contains 1. The operations t_j are more interesting: Given an index j, consider the j-th clause of φ. Since e satisfies ψ, one of the literals of the j-th clause is true. Without loss of generality, let it be the first one. We show that then $t_j(C,A,A) \subseteq C$.

We need to consider two cases. If $\lambda_{j1} = w_k$ then $e(w_k) = \text{True}$ and $w_k \in C$. The possible values of $t_j(c,y,z)$ with $c \neq 0$ are c, w_k and 1, all of which lie in C when $c \in C$. If, on the other hand, $\lambda_{j1} = \neg w_k$, then $w_k \notin C$ and the possible values of $t_j(c,y,z)$ for $c \notin \{0, w_k\}$ are c and 1. We see that (C,D) is a blocker.

Now let (C,D) be a $\{0\}$-blocker. We use (C,D) to get a satisfying assignment for ψ. First observe that $D = A$: Since D contains 0 and at least one other element, it must contain 1 (because $s_i(x,0) = 1$ for any $x \neq 0$). Then the operations s_i give us that $D = A$ (this is in fact the purpose of these operations).

We now claim that C must also contain 1. If not, then C contains at least one variable w_k. Consider the expressions $t_1(w_k,1,1), t_1(1,w_k,1), t_1(1,1,w_k)$. All of these expressions evaluate to 1, yet at least one of them must lie in C since (C,D) is a blocker. It follows that $1 \in C$.

We see that C has the form $\{1\} \cup V$ for some set of variables V. Consider the assignment e that makes all variables in V true and the rest false. We claim that e satisfies ψ. What if we are wrong? Then there is a clause, say the j-th one, none of whose literals is satisfied by e. We show that then neither $t_j(C,A,A)$, nor $t_j(A,C,A)$, nor $t_j(A,A,C)$ lie in C.

Consider $t_j(C,A,A)$; the other two cases are similar. If $\lambda_{1j} = w_k$, then $w_k \notin V$, so $w_k \notin C$. Then $t_j(1,w_k,w_k) = w_k \notin C$. If $\lambda_{1j} = \neg w_k$, we have $w_k \in C$ and $t_j(w_k,0,0) = 0 \notin C$. This contradiction completes the proof. □

While Theorem 33 (together with Theorem 2 and Theorem 26) implies that deciding absorption is co-NP-complete, this does not need to stop us in practice since the problem of deciding the existence of a B-blocker is fixed parameter tractable when parametrized by the product of all arities of the basic operations in $\mathbf{A}$. The idea is to guess the indices in item (5) of Lemma 31 in advance and then check whether there is a (C,D) that would work:

Algorithm 34 (Deciding B-blockers)**.**
Input: Idempotent algebra $\mathbf{A}$ with basic operations $t_1, \dots, t_n$ of arities $s_1, \dots, s_n$, a subuniverse B of $\mathbf{A}$.

(1) For each $c \in A \setminus B$, $b \in B$ and each choice $j_1 \in [s_1]$, $j_2 \in [s_2]$, $\dots$, $j_n \in [s_n]$, do
   (a) Let $D = \langle b, c \rangle$,
   (b) construct a digraph $\mathbb{G}$ with the vertex set D by drawing an edge from u to v whenever $v \in t_i(D, D, \dots, D, u, D, \dots, D)$ (here u is at the j_i-th coordinate),
   (c) let C be the set of all vertices in $\mathbb{G}$ to which there is a directed path from c (in other words, C is the smallest set that contains c and together with D satisfies item (5) of Lemma 31).
   (d) If $C \cap B = \emptyset$, output the blocker (C, D), else iterate.
(2) If no blocker is found, output "No."

If the algorithm outputs a (C, D), it is easy to verify that this pair will satisfy all properties from Lemma 31. On the other hand, if $\mathbf{A}$ has a B-blocker (C', D'), then when the algorithm picks $c \in C'$, $b \in B \cap D'$ and chooses $j_1, \dots, j_n$ as the indices from item (5) for (C', D'), it will define $D = \langle b, c \rangle \subseteq D'$ and then construct some $C \subseteq C'$. It is easy to verify that because (C', D') satisfies the conditions from Lemma 31, so does (C, D), and we have a B-blocker.

To analyze the time complexity of Algorithm 34 (in the RAM model of computation), we can assume that $\mathbf{A}$ has at least one at least binary basic operation (otherwise we can simply answer "No.") and so $|A|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{A}\|$. Steps (1a) and (1b) each take time $O(\|\mathbf{A}\|)$, step (1c) is a breadth-first search that can be done in time $O(|A|^2)$ and step (1d) takes time $O(|A|)$, so each iteration of Step 1 runs in time $O(\|\mathbf{A}\|)$.

There are $O(|A|^2)$ choices of c and b and $\prod_{i=1}^{n} s_i$ choices of the indices $j_1, \dots, j_n$, giving us a total time complexity of $O(\|\mathbf{A}\||A|^2 \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{n} s_i)$. Therefore, if we keep the number and arities of basic operations of $\mathbf{A}$ bounded from above, we get a polynomial time algorithm that should work well for many idempotent algebras encountered in the wild.

The following theorem sums up our computational complexity results.

Theorem 35. *If $\mathbf{A}$ is a finite idempotent algebra, $B \leq \mathbf{A}$ then*

(1) *deciding whether $B \trianglelefteq_{\mathrm{J}} \mathbf{A}$ is in P,*
(2) *deciding whether $\mathbf{A}$ contains a B-blocker is NP-complete even if $\mathbf{A}$ is in a congruence distributive variety and B is a singleton,*
(3) *deciding whether $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$ is co-NP-complete, but is fixed parameter tractable if we parametrize the problem by the product of all arities of the basic operations in $\mathbf{A}$.*

5. Conclusion

We have shown that B is an absorbing subuniverse of a finite idempotent algebra $\mathbf{A}$ if and only if B Jónsson absorbs $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{A}$ has no B-blockers. Our result can be seen, for finite algebras, as "decomposed" version of the fact [10, 17] that a finite algebra $\mathbf{A}$ has an NU term if and only if $\mathbf{A}$ has Jónsson terms and a cube term. Indeed, in view of Proposition 4, Corollary 8 and [16, Theorem 3.4], this fact can be equivalently phrased as follows: Finite idempotent algebra $\mathbf{A}$ has all singletons

absorbing if and only if $\mathbf{A}$ has all singletons Jónsson absorbing and has no $\{a\}$-blockers for any $a \in A$. (For non-idempotent finite algebras, we can formulate a similar statement by replacing $\mathbf{A}$ with the full idempotent reduct of $\mathbf{A}$.) While having all singletons absorbing (that is, having an NU term) is quite a strong property of algebras, having some proper absorbing subuniverse is quite common – for instance, any pair of non-commuting congruences of a finite idempotent algebra $\mathbf{A}$ with a Taylor term forces a proper absorbing subuniverse in a subalgebra of $\mathbf{A}$ (by the Absorption Theorem [5]). For this reason, it seems that our theorem promises much wider applicability.

Several other results about algebras with NU terms or Jónsson terms can be decomposed in a similar way. For instance, Proposition 16 can be regarded as a decomposed version of a part of the Baker-Pixley theorem [1], and Theorem 26 generalizes [19, Proposition 5.7] in a similar way. A natural questions arise – how to generalize, in a such a way, other results about algebras with NU terms or Jónsson terms (eg. Jónsson's Lemma) and what other Maltsev conditions have useful decomposed versions?

As an application of the main theorem we have shown that absorption $B \trianglelefteq \mathbf{A}$ is decidable, where $\mathbf{A}$ is given by tables of operations. Another way how to define an algebra is by means of relations – to every relational structure $\mathbb{A}$ one assigns so called *algebra of polymorphism* whose operations are those which are compatible with every relation of $\mathbb{A}$. A version of the main theorem for polymorphism algebras and decidability of the corresponding absorption problem is provided in [3].

Acknowledgements

Libor Barto and Alexandr Kazda were supported by the the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic, grant GAČR 13-01832S. Alexandr Kazda was supported by European Research Council under the European Unions Seventh Framework Programme (FP7/2007-2013)/ERC grant agreement no 616160.

References

[1] Kirby A. Baker and Alden F. Pixley. Polynomial interpolation and the Chinese remainder theorem for algebraic systems. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 143:165–174, 1975.

[2] Libor Barto. The dichotomy for conservative constraint satisfaction problems revisited. In *26th Annual IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science (LICS)*, pages 301–310, Washington, 2011. IEEE.

[3] Libor Barto and Jakub Bulín. Deciding absorption in relational structures. in preparation.

[4] Libor Barto and Marcin Kozik. Congruence distributivity implies bounded width. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(4):1531–1542, 2009.

[5] Libor Barto and Marcin Kozik. Absorbing subalgebras, cyclic terms, and the constraint satisfaction problem. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, 8(1), 2012.

[6] Libor Barto and Marcin Kozik. Robust satisfiability of constraint satisfaction problems. In *Proceedings of the 44th symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '12, pages 931–940, 2012.

[7] Libor Barto and Marcin Kozik. Constraint satisfaction problems solvable by local consistency methods. *J. ACM*, 61(1):3:1–3:19, January 2014.

[8] Libor Barto, Marcin Kozik, and David Stanovský. Mal'tsev conditions, lack of absorption, and solvability. *Algebra universalis*, 74(1-2):185–206, 2015.

[9] Clifford Bergman. *Universal Algebra: Fundamentals and Selected Topics*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press, Boca Raton and New York and Abingdon, 1 edition, 2011.

[10] Joel Berman, Paweł Idziak, Petar Markovic, Ralph McKenzie, Matthew Valeriote, and Ross Willard. Varieties with few subalgebras of powers. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 362:1445–1473, 2010.

[11] Stanley Burris and H. P. Sankappanavar. *A Course in Universal Algebra*. Springer, New York, graduate texts in mathematics edition, 2012. The Millenium Edition (electronic book).
[12] Bjarni Jónsson. Algebras whose congruence lattices are distributive. *Math. Scand.*, 21:110–121 (1968), 1967.
[13] Alexandr Kazda, Marcin Kozik, Ralph McKenzie, and Matt Moore. Absorption and directed Jónsson terms. In *Don Pigozzi on Abstract Algebraic Logic, Universal Algebra and Computer Science*, Outstanding Contributions to Logic. (accepted).
[14] Alexandr Kazda and Dmitriy Zhuk. Arities and decision procedures for cube terms. manuscript.
[15] Keith A. Kearnes and Ágnes Szendrei. Clones of algebras with parallelogram terms. *International Journal of Algebra and Computation*, 22(01):1250005, 2012.
[16] Petar Marković, Miklós Maróti, and Ralph McKenzie. Finitely related clones and algebras with cube terms. *Order*, 29(2):345–359, 2012.
[17] Petar Marković and Ralph McKenzie. Few subpowers, congruence distributivity and near-unanimity terms. *Algebra Universalis*, 58:119–128(10), March 2008.
[18] Miklós Maróti. The existence of a near-unanimity term in a finite algebra is decidable. *The Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 74:1001–1014, 9 2009.
[19] Matthew A. Valeriote and Ralph Freese. On the complexity of some Maltsev conditions. *International Journal of Algebra and Computation*, 19(2):451–464, 2009.
[20] J. H. van Lint and R. M. Wilson. *A Course in Combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press, 2nd edition, 2001.

Department of Algebra, Charles University, Sokolovská 83, 186 00 Praha 8, Czech Republic
E-mail address: libor.barto@gmail.com
URL: http://www.karlin.mff.cuni.cz/~barto/

Institute of Science and Technology Austria, Am Campus 1, 3400, Klosterneuburg, Austria
E-mail address: alex.kazda@gmail.com
URL: http://pub.ist.ac.at/~akazda